# REPORT

OF THE

# National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

## Year Ending December 31, 1901.

---

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS,
74 India Street,
1902.

# Notices.

This Report, as usual, deals only with the chief topics of interest in the last year. Preceding Reports will be found useful for a similar reason. Reports for 1890 and most later years, except 1898, can still be supplied to those who may need them. This includes the Report of 1895, "A Review of Fifteen Years," of which some copies are still available. Stamps for postage are always welcome.

A small tract of fifteen pages on "The Pastor and the Home;" a paper on the origin and principles of "The Home Department of the Sunday School;" a Report to the National Council of Congregational Churches on "The Family;" and a leaflet on "The Aims, Methods, and Results of Our Work" can still be supplied freely to all applicants. Few copies are now in print of other and more important papers.

Reports of the Commissions on Uniform Legislation can be obtained from their Secretary, Albert E. Henschel, 214 Broadway, New York.

The Report of the Hon. Carroll E. Wright, LL.D., Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, can be had on application addressed to the Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Unsolicited contributions are doubly useful in a society like the League. The time and thought of the Corresponding Secretary should be conserved for his proper work.

Associate Annual Membership is invited from those who cannot give large sums. This is freely granted to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year. Such persons become members in full for the time. *If you cannot be a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership, with the fee, and thus share in this work for the Family?* Every one who has profited by the work of the League, or who believes in its mission, is urgently requested to aid us by a contribution of money.

The Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass., will gratefully acknowledge all contributions sent to him.

Correspondence relating to the work of the League should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass. Contributions may also be sent directly to him.

---

# Minutes.

---

The Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held at the Diocesan House, on Joy Street, at 2.30 P.M. Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., presided in the absence of the President. Bishop Lawrence offered prayer. The Recording Secretary read the records of the last meeting, and they were approved. The Report of the Treasurer was presented by Mr. Wm. G. Benedict, which was accepted and referred to Mr. W. B. Herrick as auditor.

The following resolution was voted: —

*Resolved*, That the National League for the Protection of the Family, which under its former name of the National Divorce Reform League proposed and did much to secure the report on marriage and divorce which was made by the Department of Labor, the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., Commissioner, in 1889, now desires that Congress make provision for such a supplementary investigation and report as will bring that earlier work from 1886 down to date. This is urged in the belief that such a work is now greatly needed, and will prove of much value, in the study and practical treatment of social and legal questions of present and permanent concern to the entire people of the United States.

The Corresponding Secretary, S. W. Dike, LL.D., submitted his annual report, of which he read only certain parts and commented upon other parts. The report was adopted, and Dr. Dike was instructed to print and circulate the same according to his discretion. It was voted that the officers of last year serve for the ensuing year.

*President*, Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D.

*Vice-Presidents*, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., President George Harris, D.D., LL.D.

*Corresponding Secretary*, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

*Recording Secretary*, Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D.
*Treasurer*, Mr. William G. Benedict.
*Executive Committee*, President George Harris, D.D., LL.D., President M. H. Buckham, D.D., LL.D., Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Rev. James De Normandie, Prof. Albion W. Small, Ph.D., Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Rev. William H. Cobb, D.D., Mr. Everett O. Fisk, Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.

Voted to adjourn.

C. H. SPALDING,
*Recording Secretary.*

*Boston, Mass., Jan. 22, 1902.*

# Report of Corresponding Secretary.

The year 1901 has, on the whole, witnessed a decided increase of interest in the Family and its various problems. In one direction this increase of interest is remarkable. The proposed canon on marriage and divorce for the Protestant Episcopal Church had a large place in public discussion throughout the year. Christians of all faiths and citizens without regard to their ecclesiastical affiliations watched the discussion and studied the subject anew. Our own correspondence brought many inquiries for information both before and after the Convention at San Francisco. Indeed, the call from Episcopalians for information and lectures or addresses has increased since the Convention adjourned.

## A PRESENT PROBLEM OF THE CHURCHES.

It is significant that almost at the same time and in two cities as far apart as San Francisco and Portland, Me., and without the slightest preconceived arrangement, the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the National Council of the Congregational churches took substantially the same action. This was the appointment of committees by each body to arrange, if possible, with as many Christian bodies as possible, some plan of harmonious action in regard to the marriage of divorced persons and others who cannot be married without violation of the regulations of the churches concerned.

Our last Report spoke of this point at some length, and made some practical suggestions which seem to have been favorably received. Already members of these committees have invited suggestions from us. Some of these appear in a letter in the *Churchman* of Jan. 18, 1902. It is to be hoped that some reasonable plan may be devised by which the churches of the country may support each other in their efforts to maintain a higher standard regarding the sacred character of marriage. Of course this is only one of many parts of the subject of the Family needing attention. But harmonious action here may lead to still larger things. Let us do what we can, even though we come far short of our ideals. Beginning with those things that seem easiest of accomplishment, we may go on to the larger tasks with greater confidence.

The hearty co-operation of nearly a dozen religious bodies in Rhode Island, to which reference will be made later in this Report, shows what can be done in this direction by courtesy and good sense. The problems of the Church here, as in other things, often closely resemble those of the State, and their solution may well go on together. Some of our churches have yet to learn how much they can do towards the improvement of municipal conditions by a thorough and business-like attention to ecclesiastical affairs. If we may use the term in no narrow sense, we often need to learn that training in good churchmanship is the best of contributions to good citizenship.

## THE LEGISLATION OF THE YEAR.

This has been about the same in amount as is usual in the year when most Legislatures meet and in the right direction.

District of Columbia. Congress has radically changed the divorce laws of the District at the request of leading citizens, who were much disturbed by the abuses under the old law, and who believed that the capital of the nation should set a high standard for the country. Only one of the four grounds for absolute divorce formerly allowed is retained, — that of adultery. For the other three, — cruelty, drunkenness, and desertion, — separation from bed and board only is now permitted. The term of residence before application for divorce can be made has been increased to three years.

Florida. The Acts of the last Legislature are not yet at hand; but it is credibly reported that this State has, at the instance of a rich resident or citizen, made insanity a ground for divorce, but not without vigorous protest. This is the only step backward in the year's legislation.

Indiana. An Emergency Act, so called, has been passed in this State. This applies only to Marion County, which includes the city of Indianapolis, where there were 626 divorces in the year 1900, to 2,363 marriages in the same period. This Act requires the appearance for the State of the Prosecuting Attorney of the county in all cases in which there is no *bona fide* appearance of counsel for the defence.

Minnesota joins the States in the West that now prohibit the solicitation of divorce business by any form of advertising. It also follows another growing practice in legislation by making unlawful the marriage of divorced persons within six months of the entry of the final decree of divorce. This is enforced by penalties both against the party making false statements and the clerks of courts who may issue licenses contrary to this law. The imbecile, feeble-minded, epileptic, and insane are prohibited from marrying. The requirements for the

record of the certificates of the ordination of ministers to qualify them for the legal performance of the marriage ceremony are extended to licentiates as well as to ordained ministers.

NEVADA. This State has adopted this growing custom of Western legislation, and enacts a law requiring that certificates of ordination or license to preach be presented to the court, and that then licenses to celebrate marriage be issued.

NEW HAMPSHIRE provides for the better annual collection of divorce statistics, and calls for returns from the courts of all divorces granted since 1858.

NEW YORK has a new statute defining those who may lawfully celebrate marriages. This State, after many years' agitation, has now regulated her so-called common-law marriages, very much in the way recommended not long ago by the Commissions on Uniform Legislation. All marriages by mutual consent alone must be in the form of a written contract. This contract must be signed by the two parties to it, and duly witnessed and subscribed by at least two other persons, with date and place, in the same manner as in case of the conveyance of real estate. And the contract must be filed in the office of the town or city clerk within six months. Another important law authorizes the State Board of Health to publish statistics of births and marriages as well as of deaths. It is to be regretted that divorces were not also included.

NORTH DAKOTA has two new laws in the direction in which State legislation has been moving in recent years. One forbids the remarriage of divorced persons for three months after the decree of divorce. The other has removed incurable insanity from the State list of causes. The recent law increasing the term of required residence before divorce from ninety days to one year is retained.

OREGON now forbids the remarriage of all divorced persons for six months after the decree of divorce. This Act of the year 1900 was not reported a year ago, as we should have done.

WISCONSIN also forbids the remarriage of all divorced persons, but makes the term one year. Special permission, however, to marry sooner may be granted by the court.

WYOMING is reported to have raised the term of residence before divorce from six months to one year, but no copy of the laws of the last session of the Legislature is at hand for verification.

OUR NEW POSSESSIONS. Congress has slightly changed the laws in these relating to marriage and divorce. Hawaii grants divorce for adultery, imprisonment for life, or more than seven years, and for leprosy. The Civil Code of Porto Rico and the Philippines seems to have been modified but little. Absolute divorce is not allowed. The

causes for judicial separation are now adultery of either party, actual violence and grave insults, violence to the wife to make her change her religion, proposal of the husband to prostitute his wife or children, and condemnation of either party to hard labor.

## THE TREND OF LEGISLATION.

For the year this follows the general course of the last ten or fifteen years. This has covered the prescription of parties who may celebrate marriages; the adoption of the better system of marriage licenses; the more careful regulation of the returns of marriages; the exclusion of divorce advertising; the repeal of "omnibus clauses" and generally of the statutes permitting divorce for insanity; the increase of the term of residence required before divorce from lesser periods to at least one year; and the provision against the immediate marriage of divorced persons. A strong tendency towards uniformity holds throughout.

Of the important exceptional legislation, which seems likely to have more or less following, is that of New York and the District of Columbia already reported, and especially the law of Delaware intended to keep parties from coming into the State for divorce, and to respect principles of inter-state comity. The Commissions on Uniformity now recommend it in the following form: —

SECTION 1. "No divorce shall be granted for any cause arising prior to the residence of the complainant or defendant in this State, which was not ground for divorce in the State where the cause arose."

SECTION 2. "The word 'divorce' in this Act shall be deemed to mean divorce from the bond of marriage."

As this is hardly a measure of procedure, the Commissioners have taken it out of the list of sections reported under that head a year ago and given it a place by itself, making it a separate Act instead of a section of their one general bill.

## THE NEW AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION.

Among the powers expressly given to the Australian Parliament by this document are "marriage; divorce and matrimonial causes; and in relation thereto parental rights, and the custody and guardianship of children." From Quick and Garran's Annotated Constitution of Australia we learn certain things of interest to us in this country. At first there was a strong desire to leave the last clause in such a way as to give Parliament complete control of these subjects in all cases; but it was finally restricted to cases connected with divorce and matrimonial causes only. It was found "anomalous for a Federal law to dissolve a marriage, and for a State law to decide the destiny of the children of

the marriage." And to quote further: "Outside and independent of the area covered by divorce and matrimonial causes, the power of the State to deal with parental rights remains unchanged."

This attempt at the distribution of the various parts of Family law, giving part into the control of the Parliament and leaving the rest to the care of the State Legislatures, will be watched with much interest for its possible difficulties in practice. I called attention to the point as one needing attention in our own discussion of uniformity by Constitutional amendment, in an article in the *Arena* of September, 1890, and noted it in our Report for the same year. It certainly is an element in our problem of uniformity if sought through an amendment of the Constitution carrying marriage and divorce over to the control of Congress, though it may or may not be of conclusive force.

## UNIFORM LEGISLATION.

We are unable to report the adoption of the proposed Uniform Law of Divorce Procedure by any States as yet. Several causes have contributed to this. Attention has been concentrated largely upon another measure of the Commissions on Uniformity, which the Commissions desire to precede the Divorce Procedure Bill, — that relating to Negotiable Bills, which has been enacted in seventeen States. A warm discussion has sprung up in high legal circles over the latter measure, and this has tended to delay, for a time, action upon all recommendations of the Commissions. Then the Commissioners, being themselves without compensation, except in a few instances for travelling expenses, cannot as a rule afford the time and money necessary to bring their measures before Legislatures. So only those proposals which appeal more directly to pecuniary interests, like that relating to Negotiable Bills, get much attention, unless in a case like that of Rhode Island, where the three eminent lawyers who are the Commissioners on Uniformity have given much attention to the subject, aiding the clergymen and other citizens having the matter in charge in every practicable way.

We urge our friends in every State and Territory, especially in the thirty-three which now have these Commissions, to initiate movements for reform in their own States. These need not seek for large numbers or hold great public meetings; but they should enlist a goodly number of representative men of high standing and experience in public affairs. Most States have abuses peculiar to themselves or common to many. Attention should be given to these and to the measures recommended by the Commissions on Uniformity. The two objects may and should be secured without conflict. The Bill of the Commissions may be found in our own Report of a year ago, and in its slightly changed form, in the last Report of the Commissions them-

selves, just issued. The President of the Commissions, Hon. Amasa M. Eaton, Providence, R. I., will doubtless answer all inquiries concerning this work that may be addressed to him. The patriotic and self-sacrificing efforts of these Commissioners should receive the hearty co-operation of citizens of all classes. Their work has been said to be the most important of the kind ever undertaken in the country.

## DIVORCE BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

This subject has not reached the Supreme Court of the United States, if we mistake not, in more than a score of cases in its entire history. Of these, four were decided, or opinions announced, the past year, and in a way, it is claimed by the Commissioners on Uniformity, that shows that their proposed Uniform Act would be sustained by the Court should cases under it be carried up from the State courts. These four cases are known as Atherton vs. Atherton, Bell vs. Bell, Streitwolf vs. Streitwolf, Lynch vs. Lynch. (See opinions of the United States Supreme Court, October term, 1900.)

## DIVORCE REFORM IN RHODE ISLAND.

The movement for divorce reform in Rhode Island, of which we took notice a year ago, and which nearly succeeded then, has been renewed on a broader basis and with increased energy. It has the support of representative men from nearly all the religious organizations of the State and of the highest standing as jurists, educators, and business men. Abundant time has been taken to study the subject thoroughly in the best light. A bill has been drawn after the most careful criticism, and introduced in the Legislature, the Governor having also urged reform in his message. The proposed law strikes at certain evils peculiar to Rhode Island, but also incorporates the essential provisions of the bill recommended by the State Commission on Uniform Legislation.

## STATISTICS OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

The call for the latest statistics is increasing. Many are anxious to get the data since 1886, the last year whose figures were included in the Report of the Department of Labor at Washington, which was published in 1889. As only eight or nine States collect and publish their statistics of marriage and divorce, and many changes have since been made in the laws relating to these subjects, it has become very important that a supplementary investigation be ordered to bring that Report down to date. When this is done we can study the movement for thirty-five years with a good degree of intelligence. The problem of uniformity will have further light thrown upon it. We have already

taken steps to secure this investigation as soon as practicable. The resolution of the League will be found in the Minutes. All interested are requested to urge provision for it upon their representatives in Congress. A comparatively small sum of money only is needed for the work.

## SUGGESTIVE FIGURES.

Our own collection of statistics from the few sources open to private effort gives some interesting results. Connecticut, once regarded as the worst of Eastern States in respect of easy divorce, now shows some improvement as compared with the increase of population, and even absolutely; for she has granted fewer divorces in the last seven years than in the preceding seven. A better public sentiment and a more careful procedure of the courts seem to be the chief reasons for this. The ratio of divorces to marriages is now 1 to 15.8. In earlier years it was as high as 1 to 9. Rhode Island, on the contrary, now grants four hundred or more annually, or 1 to 8.2 marriages. In Massachusetts divorces are increasing, though as yet the ratio is not more than 1 to 20.2, and the number granted in 1889 was 1,163. I have tried in vain to get New Jersey figures for recent years; for although this State adds desertion to the one cause for which divorce is permitted in New York, her rate is much lower than in New York. One divorce to fifty marriages is about the highest ratio known in New Jersey. This is largely due to the peculiar conditions of the administration of the divorce laws in that State, which puts all divorce suits into its Court of Chancery, whose methods secure thorough trials.

Three or four typical States in the interior give some striking figures. Divorces in Oklahoma increased from 2,270 in 1889 to 3,217 in 1899, and the ratio to marriages has become 1 to 10.9. There were 2,418 divorces in Michigan in the year 1900, or 1 to 9.6 marriages. Here about two-thirds of the applications are granted. In some States three-fourths of the suits are successful. In Michigan the statistics show that nearly all the divorces are granted to residents of the State. Indiana shows a remarkable change for the worse. Almost a generation ago Indiana was notoriously bad. Then the laws were improved and her divorce-rate was no worse than that of some States in the East; but for some unexplained reason divorces of late have increased rapidly. In 1899 there were granted no less than 4,031 divorces, and 4,699 in the year 1900. In the last year the ratio of divorces to the marriages of the same year became 1 to 5.7 for the entire State, and as was shown in another place, much worse in the county containing Indianapolis.



## ERRATUM.

On page 11, in the second line of the last paragraph, substitute "Ohio" for "Oklahoma."

We are assured that the data showing the number of divorced persons married each year in Connecticut will be tabulated. The admirable vital statistics of Michigan give much excellent material for study. The German statistics for 1900, the first year under the uniform law for the entire empire, have not yet reached us. It is difficult for private parties to bring together the figures of even a few States and countries for recent years. A supplementary report by the Department of Labor can easily enable us to do this for our own and many other countries, and with many valuable details of the great social movement which it indicates.

## A LOW BIRTH-RATE.

The slow growth or positive decrease in the members of Sunday schools and some other agencies of the churches has drawn attention to the low birth-rate that prevails in some of our States, especially in that class of population known as the native stock. Some of our States show a birth-rate so much lower than that of France, where the subject has become a matter of grave public concern, that it has been assigned as the chief or leading cause for the decline of Sunday schools and of public schools in country towns, and perhaps of other associations made up of the young. Two things, however, should be said in qualification. There has been no such recent and sudden decline in the birth-rate as the losses in Sunday schools indicate. On the contrary, it has been going on for thirty or forty years, with fluctuations usually periodic. And again, American statistics of births are as a rule hardly complete enough to warrant very confident conclusions from comparisons made with other countries.

But after making these allowances, we must say that students and friends of American family life may well give serious attention to the evidently lessening size of the American family that has been going on for several generations on American soil. If French patriotism is concerned for its low birth-rate a half-century or so too late, we may do well to consider our own tendencies before recovery is practically impossible, or extremely difficult. So far as the statistics go the situation is beginning to be a grave one. A serious feature with us is that the fewest children are often, if not generally, found in families apparently the best able, in a general way, to care for them, leaving the less fit to make the larger contributions to the succeeding generations. It is alleged, too, that sterility among American women is increasing, from various causes.

## LECTURES AND ADDRESSES.

Lectures have been given the past year in the Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, and the Berkeley Divinity School in Middle-

town, Ct.; in the Theological Seminaries in Andover, Newton, and Hartford; in the University of Pennsylvania, and the Woman's College in Baltimore. Some other engagements have been put over to the present year. Various clubs, ministerial associations, and conferences or conventions have invited addresses. This department of work would be used more if we had more money for general expenses and more time could be spared from the work of correspondence — always an absorbing and important part of the duties of the Secretary — and from the collection of the necessary funds to support the work. The last is a serious draft upon his energies, though it may take less of his time than the proper correspondence that comes to him from those interested in our various subjects.

## PUBLICATIONS.

We are continually asked for publications of our own that we are no longer able to furnish, for lack of funds for printing. Nearly all our former issues are now out of print, and the determination to keep our expenses as far as possible within our resources has prevented their reissue and the publication of other papers.

Mr. James Bryce has just given to the public a large volume of Essays in Jurisprudence and History (Macmillan and Company). Nearly one hundred pages of this book are given to a study of "Marriage and Divorce under Roman and English Law." Probably no one is so competent for the treatment of this subject from the point of view given by historical jurisprudence as Mr. Bryce. Those who wish for a clear and authentic presentation of the subject in its historical relations should read this essay. Of our American legislation Mr. Bryce says, it "presents the largest and the strangest, and perhaps the saddest body of legislative experiments in the sphere of family law which free self-governing communities have ever tried."

Mr. Bryce, in summing up the general result of his survey, says in his closing paragraph: "The material progress of the world, the mastery of man over nature through a knowledge of her laws, the diffusion of knowledge and of the opportunities for acquiring it, are themes which ceaselessly employ the tongues of speakers and the pens of journalists, while they swell with pride the heart of the ordinary citizen. But they are not the things upon which the moral advancement of mankind or the happiness of individuals chiefly turns. They co-exist, as the statistics of recent years show, with an increase over all, or nearly all, civilized countries, of lunacy, of suicide, and of divorce."

We wish that Mr. Bryce's essay could be reprinted in separate form for general use and read along with the analysis of the laws of marriage and divorce in the United States and Europe given in the Government Report of 1889, which we hope will be brought down to date soon.

## THE HOPEFUL OUTLOOK.

There are some, probably many, who, feeling the force of these words of Mr. Bryce, and experiencing some disappointment over the failure of the great effort of the Protestant Episcopal Church to reach an agreement concerning its own canons, and of the Commissions on Uniformity to get their proposed Act adopted in a single State, will take a gloomy view of the present situation. We do not share this despondency, and for several reasons. Interest in the subject has undoubtedly deepened and extended the past year far more than usual. This in the long run is better than the adoption of many measures with less interest. Then it seems to us, as our Report last year indicated, that the deeper feeling is growing that in the Church as well as in the State, whatever action is proposed must rest on broad and sure foundations. Neither more Biblical interpretation, nor ecclesiastical tradition, nor legal history, nor physiological consideration, nor social science will alone afford a safe and sufficient ground for approach to the solution of the problems of marriage and divorce, or any of the many other incidents of the Family. All these sources of aid must be used by those who attack any specific problem. Comprehension of all true interests, and not the triumph of a party or of parties, must be more and more the aim of all concerned. Better do little or nothing for a time than to win a grudgingly conceded measure. The truest success can come only as we build on the broadest and deepest foundations.

Apparently this view contributed to the result at San Francisco. The difficulties, the intricacies, and the ramifications of all problems of the Family inevitably grow with our study, especially if this study takes us out from the narrower lines of tradition and ecclesiasticism into the broader field of history and social science. As our Report last year said,—to which, and to earlier Reports readers are now referred for discussions beyond our present limits,—the growth of interest in social science will carry the attention of students to the Family much in the way biology has directed attention to the study of the cell. And if the Church is at first thrown back in its approach, it may prove that this is in the end a gain both in power and in practical results.

## THE LARGER USE OF THE HOME.

There has been, the past year, continued interest in this subject on which we have spoken in former years. That a sound, vigorous home life is the best protection of the Home itself, as well as of the interests of Religion, Education, Industry, and Government, is getting a stronger practical hold upon our religious teachers, and those in charge of our educational institutions generally. There is of late, more than in for-

mer years, a growing feeling that somehow there is a multiplicity of agencies in some of our churches that may have been well enough for a time, but which, like too many plants in a flower-pot, seem often to choke each other's fullest growth and to keep the Home too much in the shade of them all. The call is increasing for readjustment, for true organization, so that there shall be real economy of agencies and their uses as seen from the interests of the whole.

## THE STUDY OF SECONDARY SOCIAL GROUPS.

From what has just been said it will be seen that the study and treatment of social groups of the secondary type is intimately connected with that of the primary group, — the Family and Home. In other words, the Home is most directly in contact with and affected by social institutions of the communal type. To this group belong the local church, the local school, the shop or factory, the town, and the fraternities and societies of all sorts that collect their members from the Homes of the people. It is by the growth of these that the Home is most directly and largely affected, whether for good or for evil. And it is because of the close connection of these two — the primary and secondary groups of social institutions — that our interest in the Family has compelled much attention to the secondary group, to whose growth the last century contributed greatly, and especially in the sphere of the Church. The study of this secondary group by the best methods of social science, with some illustrations of its practical need, was urged by your Secretary in the *Journal of Sociology* for November, 1901.

The reduction of the large number of societies, clubs, and the like, which have come into our churches and other social work, to some symmetrical order by which efficiency and economy may be secured and the Home given its proper place would seem to be one of the leading social questions of the new century.

In other words, there are now in many quarters ecclesiastical conditions much like those which gave us the municipal problem, and resembling those which have compelled the reorganization of many kinds of business in the interests of greater economy and efficiency. This is but another way of saying that social problems are so closely related that the urgent questions of one class of institutions cannot long be isolated from similar questions in another. The Church cannot give serious attention to civic or economic reforms without discovering that these run back into the Church itself. The finer social sense, like the true spiritual sense, will discover this fact and act upon its significance. We repeat — the study and treatment of social groups of the secondary type is intimately connected with that of the primary group. And we

add that, when we get to the bottom, the problems of groups of the secondary class, whether they are religious, industrial, civic, or any other, so run into each other that they are essentially one.

## RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES.

The receipts for the year for the regular expenses were $2,206.73, and the expenses were $2,244.78, leaving a deficit of $38.05. After the generous response of a large number of our contributors the year before, by which $1,058, or more than two-thirds of the accumulated debt, was paid, it was thought best to refrain from pressing for the payment of the rest. Yet $145.25 have come for this purpose without solicitation, leaving now only a total debt of $387.63 due the Corresponding Secretary. Our expenses have been kept as near as possible to our probable receipts.

Unsolicited contributions, with appreciative words, sometimes come to us and are greatly valued. So are those donations that come early in the year, when expenses are heaviest and the outlook uncertain. A more generous provision for publication and traveling expenses would greatly enhance the value of our work.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,

*Corresponding Secretary.*

# Treasurer's Report.

WM. G. BENEDICT, *Treasurer.*

In account with the National League for the Protection of the Family.

| DR. | | CR. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dec. 31, 1901. | | Dec. 31, 1901. | |
| To Special Donations for the Reduction of Debt, as per details in Cash Book . . . . . | $145.25 | By Disbursements for the year 1901, as per Cash Book : | |
| | | General Expenses, — | |
| | | Travelling . . . | $224.40 |
| | | Postage . . . . | 51.03 |
| | | Sundries . . . . | 9.80 |
| | | Printing . . . . | 94.80 |
| | | Stationery . . . | 14.75 |
| | | Rent . . . . . | 50.00 |
| To Receipts from Contributions for General Expenses for the work of the League, as per details in Cash Book . | $2,206.73 | Paid Secretary on account of salary ($1,800 per annum) | 1,761.95 |
| | | | $2,206.73 |
| | | MEMORANDA. | |
| | | General Expenses for 1901 . | $444.78 |
| | | Salary of Secretary . . . | 1,800.00 |
| | | | $2,244.78 |
| | | Receipts for General Expenses . . . . . | 2,206.73 |
| | | Deficiency in 1901 . . . | $38.05 |
| | | Deficiency existing Dec. 31, 1900, $494.83 | |
| | | Less Contributions for Debt, 145.25 | |
| | | | 349.58 |
| | | Existing Debt Dec. 31, 1901 . . . . . | $387.63 |

January 27, 1902. I have this day examined the above account covering the year 1901, with the vouchers therefor, and I find the same correct.

WILLIAM B. HERRICK, *Auditor.*

## CONTRIBUTIONS.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jan. 3. | Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York | $50 00 | |
| 3. | Rev. W. H. Moore, Hartford, Conn. | 3 00 | |
| 9. | Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn. | 35 00 | |
| 9. | Mrs. Robert K. Redington, Fall River | 10 00 | |
| 10. | St. Thomas' Church, Taunton | 10 00 | |
| 15. | Rt. Rev. Robert Codman, Jr., Portland, Me. | 2 00 | |
| 15. | Congregational Church, Pawtucket, R. I. | 2 00 | |
| 17. | Pres. Wm. J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., Hanover, N. H. | 10 00 | |
| 18. | Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H. | 5 00 | |
| 19. | Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge | 2 00 | |
| 19. | State St. Congregational Church, Portland, Me. | 25 00 | |
| 22. | Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn. | 25 00 | |
| 26. | Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Centre | 5 00 | |
| | Received in January | | $184 00 |
| Feb. 2. | Rt. Rev. Wm. Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston | $25 00 | |
| 2. | St. Paul's Church, New Haven, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 7. | Asylum Hill Church, Hartford, Conn. | 25 00 | |
| 11. | Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Newton Centre | 5 00 | |
| 11. | Charles E. Ranlett, Auburndale | 5 00 | |
| 12. | Hon. Wm. E. Dodge, New York | 100 00 | |
| 12. | Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I. | 10 00 | |
| 12. | Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester | 50 00 | |
| 13. | Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester | 5 00 | |
| 13. | Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston | 5 00 | |
| 13. | Prof. Edward Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover | 5 00 | |
| 15. | James C. Braman, Auburndale | 10 00 | |
| 18. | Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston | 5 00 | |
| 19. | Rev. James W. Cooper, D.D., New Britain, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 19. | Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y. | 10 00 | |
| 22. | Old South Church, Boston | 25 00 | |
| 23. | Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D., Cambridge | 5 00 | |
| 25. | Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me. | 5 00 | |
| 25. | St. James Church, New York | 25 00 | |
| 26. | Rev. C. W. Huntington, D.D., Lowell | 5 00 | |
| 26. | Rev. Wm. Prall, D.D., Albany, N. Y. | 5 00 | |
| 26. | George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Pa. | 25 00 | |
| 28. | South Cong'l Church, West Roxbury | 3 00 | |
| 28. | Pawtucket Cong'l Church, Pawtucket, R. I. | 50 00 | |
| | Received in February | | $418 00 |
| Mar. 2. | Henry G. Marquand, New York | $5 00 | |
| 4. | Rev. Francis N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale | 10 00 | |
| 4. | Pres. Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington | 10 00 | |
| 7. | Rev. Minot Osgood Simons, Cleveland, O. | 5 00 | |
| 7. | Rev. Wm. P. Alcott, Boxford. | 2 00 | |
| 7. | Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., LL.D., Burlington, Vt. | 5 00 | |
| 7. | Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt. | 5 00 | |
| 8. | Morris K. Jesup, New York | 10 00 | |
| 8. | Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., St. Louis, Mo. | 5 00 | |
| 8. | "L. H. W.," Boston | 10 00 | |
| 8. | Mrs. R. H. Dana, Cambridge | 5 00 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mar. 12. | The Very Rev. Dean E. A. Hoffman, D.D., LL.D., New York | $25 00 | |
| 12. | Rt. Rev. Wm. Crosswell Doane, D.D., LL.D., Albany | 5 00 | |
| 12. | Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H. | 5 00 | |
| 12. | Rev. A. Moss Merwin, Pasadena, Cal. | 3 00 | |
| 12. | Sunday School, Second Congregational Church, Norwich, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 13. | Robert C. Ogden, New York | 25 00 | |
| 13. | Grace Church, Providence, R. I. | 25 00 | |
| 13. | Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Washington | 15 00 | |
| 20. | Col. Chas. A. Hopkins, Brookline | 10 00 | |
| 20. | A. F. Weber, Albany, New York | 5 00 | |
| 22. | Rev. Chas. F. Dole, Jamaica Plain | 5 00 | |
| 28. | All Saints' Church, Worcester | 10 00 | |
| | Received in March | | $210 00 |
| Apr. 1. | Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham | $10 00 | |
| 5. | South Congregational Church, Springfield | 25 00 | |
| 6. | George B. Knapp, Boston | 10 00 | |
| 10. | Prof. Henry W. Farnham, Ph.D., New Haven, Conn. | 25 00 | |
| 12. | Rev. H. C. Trumbull, D.D., LL.D., Philadelphia, Pa. | 5 00 | |
| 12. | Rev. S. W. Dana, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa. | 5 00 | |
| 13. | Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Pa. | 10 00 | |
| 15. | W. P. Henzy, Philadelphia, Pa. | 25 00 | |
| 15. | St. Luke's and The Epiphany, Philadelphia, Pa. | 10 00 | |
| 20. | Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill. | 2 00 | |
| 25. | Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge | 25 00 | |
| 25. | Herbert A. Wilder, Newton | 10 00 | |
| 25. | Robert H. Gardiner, Chestnut Hill | 5 00 | |
| | Received in April | | $167 00 |
| May 2. | Nicholas Sheldon, Providence, R. I. | $10 00 | |
| 2. | Alfred Metcalf, Providence, R. I. | 5 00 | |
| 2. | Hon. James Tillinghast, Providence, R. I. | 10 00 | |
| 2. | Chas. Morris Smith, Providence, R. I. | 10 00 | |
| 2. | Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I. | 5 00 | |
| 4. | St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I. | 10 00 | |
| 4. | William Gammel, Providence, R. I. | 5 00 | |
| 4. | Cash, Providence, R. I. | 1 00 | |
| 9. | Rev. Herbert W. Lathe, Pasadena, Cal. | 5 00 | |
| 9. | Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston | 10 00 | |
| 10. | Woman's Missionary Society, St. Anne's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. | 5 00 | |
| 13. | Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., LL.D., Wilmington, Del. | 3 00 | |
| 15. | Itinerants' Club, Baltimore, Md. | 10 00 | |
| 28. | James Schouler, Boston | 5 00 | |
| 30. | Christ Church, Hartford, Conn. | 10 00 | |
| 31. | Rev. Charles Wood, Philadelphia, Pa. | 5 00 | |
| | Received in May | | $109 00 |
| June 5. | Rev. C. Ernest Smith, D.D., Baltimore, Md. | $5 00 | |
| 6. | Rev. Cecil F. P. Bancroft, LL.D., Andover | 5 00 | |
| 7. | W. P. Sargent, Melrose | 2 00 | |
| 19. | Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York | 20 00 | |
| 19. | Mrs. W. E. Dodge, New York | 10 00 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| June 22. | Rev. L. C. Barnes, Pittsburg, Pa. | $2 00 | |
| 22. | Rev. L. H. Dorchester, Boston | 1 00 | |
| 28. | George Ripley, Andover | 10 00 | |
| | Received in June | | $55 00 |
| July 2. | Rev. J. B. Clark, D.D., New York | $5 00 | |
| 11. | Mrs. C. P. Turner, Philadelphia, Pa. | 25 00 | |
| 13. | Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y. | 5 00 | |
| 15. | Rev. Francis Goodwin, Hartford, Conn. | 20 00 | |
| 31. | Prof. Alexander Merriam, Hartford, Conn. | 2 00 | |
| | Received in July | | $57 00 |
| Aug. 8. | St. Ann's Church, Lowell | $25 00 | |
| 8. | St. John's Church, Stamford, Conn. | 10 73 | |
| | Received in August | | $35 73 |
| Sept. 13. | Rev. Rockwell H. Potter, Hartford, Conn. | $3 00 | |
| 14. | Robert Coit, New London, Conn. | 10 00 | |
| 23. | Ginn & Co., Boston | 10 00 | |
| 24. | "A Friend," Newtonville | 3 00 | |
| | Received in September | | $26 00 |
| Oct. 4. | Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn. | $25 00 | |
| 8. | Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn. | 50 00 | |
| 8. | Rev. J. G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn. | 10 00 | |
| 9. | Mrs. A. S. Chase, Waterbury, Conn. | 25 00 | |
| 9. | Miss Sarah Bronson, Waterbury, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 9. | Mrs. Charlotte P. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn. | 10 00 | |
| 9. | Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn. | 50 00 | |
| 9. | St. John's Church, Waterbury, Conn. | 10 00 | |
| 16. | Rev. Henry C. Perkins, Portland, Me. | 5 00 | |
| 22. | Rev. C. D. Case, Terre Haute, Ind. | 1 00 | |
| 28. | Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 26. | Neighborhood Conference, So. Dennis | 10 00 | |
| | Received in October | | $206 00 |
| Nov. 1. | Prof. L. O. Brastow, D.D., New Haven, Conn. | $5 00 | |
| 7. | Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, New Haven, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 7. | "A Friend," Auburndale | 5 00 | |
| 8. | "J. H. W.," New York | 20 00 | |
| 13. | Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 13. | Rev. J. Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover | 5 00 | |
| 14. | "A Vermont Lady" | 25 00 | |
| 14. | Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown | 10 00 | |
| 15. | Crombie St. S.S., Salem | 5 00 | |
| 19. | Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester | 10 00 | |
| 21. | Prof. M. D. Crawford, Middletown, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 21. | Prof. William North Rice, Middletown, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 21. | Prof. W. W. Atwater, Middletown, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 21. | Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Conn. | 5 00 | |
| 29. | Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale | 3 00 | |
| 30. | Joseph Lee, Boston | 10 00 | |
| | Received in November | | $128 00 |
| Dec. 3. | Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge | $5 00 | |
| 3. | Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge | 20 00 | |
| 4. | Rev. A. B. Bassett, Ware | 5 00 | |
| 4. | William B. Herrick, Auburndale | 10 00 | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dec. 5. | Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn. | $50 00 |
| 5. | A Friend, Worcester | 3 00 |
| 5. | Rufus B. Fowler, Worcester | 10 00 |
| 5. | Pres. G. Stanley Hall, LL.D., Worcester | 5 00 |
| 6. | Rev. George M. Adams, D.D., Auburndale | 5 00 |
| 7. | St. Bartholomew's Church, New York | 100 00 |
| 9. | George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa. | 25 00 |
| 9. | William P. Ellison, Newton | 10 00 |
| 9. | W. W. Lockwood, New York | 5 00 |
| 11. | St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield | 10 00 |
| 12. | E. P. Dutton, New York | 10 00 |
| 12. | Rev. Llewellyn Pratt, D.D., Norwich, Conn. | 10 00 |
| 14. | Rev. Herbert Welch, Middletown, Conn. | 5 00 |
| 16. | Grace Church, New York | 25 00 |
| 17. | Hon. R. D. Benedict, New York | 5 00 |
| 17. | "A Friend" | 6 00 |
| 20. | Church of the Ascension, New York | 25 00 |
| 20. | Church of the Heavenly Rest, New York | 25 00 |
| 20. | Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York | 30 00 |
| 20. | Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale | 20 00 |
| 20. | Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston | 5 00 |
| 20. | Rev. James W. Bixler, New London, Conn. | 5 00 |
| 21. | Miss Mary I. Lockwood, New London, Conn. | 5 00 |
| 21. | Grace Church, Baltimore, Md. | 5 00 |
| 21. | A. C. Tenney, Chelsea | 2 00 |
| 23. | A Member, Eliot Church, Newton | 5 00 |
| 23. | Church of the Good Shepherd, Nashua, N. H. | 5 00 |
| 23. | J. Howard Nichols, Newton | 5 00 |
| 23. | Everett O. Fisk, Boston | 5 00 |
| 24. | Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., D.C.L., New York | 25 00 |
| 24. | Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, D.D., Providence, R. I. | 10 00 |
| 26. | Rev. W. H. Davis, D.D., Newton | 5 00 |
| 27. | Trinity Church, Hartford, Conn. | 5 00 |
| 28. | Trinity Church, Boston | 25 00 |
| 31. | Mrs. Daniel Merriman, Worcester | 10 00 |
| 31. | Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C. | 5 00 |
| 31. | Second Congregational Church, Derby, Conn. | 5 00 |
| 31. | Rev. S. S. Matthews, Danielson, Conn. | 5 00 |
| 31. | President George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst | 15 00 |
| 31. | Rev. Francis E. Clark, D.D., Auburndale | 5 00 |
| 31. | Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, Danbury, Conn. | 5 00 |
| 31. | William G. Benedict, Boston | 10 00 |
| 31. | Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn. | 5 00 |
| 31. | Union Church, Providence, R. I. | 10 00 |
| | Received for December | $611 00 |

## SPECIAL RECEIPTS FOR THE DEBT.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Jan. 19. | State Street Congregational Church, Portland, Me. | $15 25 |
| Feb. 18. | Miss M. Josephine Allen | 5 00 |
| Oct. 12. | "A Friend" | 100 00 |
| Dec. 31. | Anonymous | 25 00 |
| | Total | $145 25 |

# The League and Its Work.

The League was organized in 1881 by ex-President Woolsey of Yale and others of high standing, who were convinced that the time had come for some combined effort to counteract the evils that threaten the integrity and efficiency of the Family.

It stands for catholic, scientific, and practical methods in the protection of the Family and its development in a wholesome social order. Marriage, Divorce, Polygamy, Chastity, etc., are regarded as parts of the one inclusive problem of the Family. And the Family and its growth into the Home, it is held, should be the constant concern of religion, education, industry, and patriotism. The relative neglect of the Family in the past and the place it now holds in all departments of social science, and in practical philosophy, compel an increasing attention to it. The Family is now widely acknowledged to be one of the foremost, if not the most important, of all social problems, and one vital to many interests. "More and more," says Prof. F. G. Peabody, of Harvard University, "we have come to see within these last few years that the problem of the Family is the *crux* of modern civilization."

Practical results are already apparent. The Government Report on Marriage and Divorce, which the League proposed and secured, prepared the way for the thirty or more Commissions on Uniform Legislation on these and other subjects. Meanwhile State legislation has been kept moving in the right direction. Better systems of marriage license and regulation, the removal of "omnibus" and insanity clauses for divorce, the prohibition of divorce advertising, the increase of the term of residence before divorce is permitted in several States and all the Territories, restrictions upon the remarriage of the divorced in some, and carefully planned bills to restrict migratory and fraudulent or collusive divorces, now bear witness in many States to the practical efficiency of the movement.

The educational work of the League behind these gains is still more significant. Several higher educational institutions have been visited every year, and touch is kept with each through correspondence with teachers and students. Lectures and sometimes courses of lec-

tures are given in these on the Family and kindred problems. Libraries are supplied with our Reports and other papers. Twenty years ago these subjects were rarely touched in any educational institution. Now they are studied generally, and sometimes in extended courses.

Reviews and the periodical press generally have been used by the Secretary and others in the treatment of the Family and allied social problems. Our Annual Reports often contain important discussions, as well as a general survey of the field. Correspondence is a means of giving information and incentives to legislators, specialists, teachers, and others who seek our aid, it being our aim to do all we can through others. Churches and pastors have profited by our work. The Home Department of the Sunday school, an increasing interest in the religious work of the Home, greater attention to the Home in sermons, pastoral care, and church work, and a growing sense of its value as the best laboratory of the church, and the source of its supplies of men and money, may be cited in evidence.

A small constituency of exceptional intelligence has hitherto been the chief support of this fundamental and constructive work. We now ask for an increase of donors who are ready, if necessary, to make some sacrifice to aid us. We cannot meet the calls that come to us for various kinds of work and for publications without more money.

Checks may be sent either to the Treasurer or Corresponding Secretary, whose addresses are given on page 2 of the cover. Unsolicited donations will be especially helpful

Contributions may be sent to Mr. William G. Benedict, Treasurer, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, or directly to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL. D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass.